

Serial No. 09/912,220

Remarks Regarding the Amendments and the Official Communication

The applicants thank the Office for its review of this case to date and would like to point out that this application is to be afforded expedited treatment in that a petition for special service has been awarded in this case based on on-going infringement of claims of the application. In this response, claim 27 has been amended, claims 1-18, 23-26 and 28 have been canceled and claims 19-22, and 29-32 are being resubmitted as previously filed. The applicants greatly appreciate the Office's consideration and reconsideration of the presently submitted claims.

Office's 35 USC 103(a) Rejection of claims 1-32

In paragraph 3 of the Official Action, the Office has rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on U.S. Patent No. 6,012,098 to *Bayeh* et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,608 to *Hon* et al. In paragraphs 4-7, the Office more specifically compares the elements of claims 1-8 to the cited references alleging that each of the elements were described in at least one of the references and that it would have been obvious to combine the references. Without conceding that the Office's position is correct, the applicants have canceled claims 1-8 in the interest of moving this application towards allowance and the applicant reserves the right to reintroduce these canceled claims in a continuation application. For the very same reason, the applicants have canceled claims 9-18, 23-26 and 28.

In paragraph 8 of the Official Action, the Office alleges that claims 9-32 have similar limitations as claims 1-8 and the Office summarily rejects those claims on the same basis. The applicants respectfully submit that for at least some of these claims, this was not a proper rejection

Serial No. 09/912,220

by the Office and the applicant respectfully requests the Office to consider these claims individually. As will be further described below, some of the claims that were summarily rejected are directed towards inventive elements and limitations that were not included in claims 1-8 and were not described, suggested or taught in the cited references.

With respect to claim 19, the applicants direct the Office's attention to the recitation of the elements of "a template database" and "a best fit analyzer" are recited. These elements are certainly not present in claims 1-8. Furthermore, the applicants have carefully reviewed the cited references and have concluded that these elements are not described, suggested or taught in the cited references.

With respect to amended claim 27, which has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 28, the elements of "a template database" and "a best fit analyzer" are recited. These elements are certainly not present in claims 1-8. Furthermore, the applicants have carefully reviewed the cited references and have concluded that these elements are not described, suggested or taught in the cited references.

With respect to claim 31, the applicants direct the Office's attention to elements of "receiving an invocation request from a client device, the invocation request identifying the client device and a server-based application", "selecting an application interface particular to the client device", rendering information for the selected application interface to the client device", "invoking the server-based application", "receiving an action request from the client device", "interpreting the action request to identify changes required to the application interface", "providing rendering for the changes to the application to the client device" and "invoking a server-based application

Serial No. 09/912,220

command in accordance with the action request". These elements are certainly not present in claims 1-8. Furthermore, the applicants have carefully reviewed the cited references and have concluded that these elements are not described, suggested or taught in the cited references.

With respect to claim 32, the applicants direct the Office's attention to elements of:

"invoke the server-based application by sending an invocation request to the server",

"receive an SGML-based application interface".

"display the SGML-based application interface",

"receive an actuation of an aspect of said SGML-based application interface",

"deliver a command to the server corresponding with said actuation",

"receive the invocation request from the client",

"extract client-specific information from the client and the invocation request",

"prepare and SGML-based application interface based on the client specific information",

"transmit the SGML-based application interface to the client", and

"receive a command corresponding to an actuation of an aspect of said SGML-based application interface and in response to receiving said command prepare a modified SGML-based application interface and deliver it to the client".

These elements are certainly not present in claims 1-8. Furthermore, the applicants have carefully reviewed the cited references and have concluded that these elements are not described, suggested or taught in the cited references.

The applicants respectfully submit that 19, 27, 31 and 32 and the claims that depend from these claims are allowable over the cited art, are in condition for allowance, and have not been

Scrial No. 09/912,220

properly examined by the Office. The applicants request the Office to enter the amendments presented herein and to either issue an allowance for the presently submitted claims or cite additional art directed towards the novel aspects recited in the presently submitted claims. In either case, a final office action would not be appropriate as at least claims 19, 31 and 32 and the claims depending therefrom have been previously presented and have not been properly considered.

Conclusion

Each of the issues raised by the Office has been specifically and fully addressed. The applicant requests the Office to enter this amendment into the record and to examine the amended claims. The applicant submits that the presently submitted claims are in condition for allowance and appreciates the Office's full consideration.

If the Examiner believes that there are any issues regarding this case or the claims that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call Gregory Smith at (770) 804-9070.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory Scott Smith
Registration No. 40,819

LAVA Group Law by Smith & Frohwein
P.O. Box 88148
Atlanta, Georgia 30346
Telephone: (770) 804-9070
Facsimile: (770) 804-0900
Mobile: (404) 643-3430
Date: April 26, 2004